2/5/72

dear howard,

read your letter of 2/3, that to lattimer (fine) and the one to sm on tink's comments while awaiting lil as she grocery-shop ed this a.m. with the below-freezing weather, my incapacity and the carpenter not having come to fix around the self-installed air conditioner in my office, it is intolerable until the sun gets there, which should be soon, and then i have to return to working on themaster of p.m. i have moved into the (sun)living room for catching up on letters with thumb bothering me today. i am glad that tink was as decent as you indicate. in my thoughts i owe him an apology. from his record, with which i am only too painfully aware, this is a change and an improvement for him. you shou;d have heard him, the sum dtotal of all knowledge, teeing off on all critics, when his theft from most appeared. really bad and more arrogant and self-characterizing than i can tell you. from the impression i have formed of him, and bear in mind that it may be prejudiced and wrong because of this prejudice, i would expect that he would add what may not be essential criticism. i refer to what you call your presentation and style. the first term is too indefinite for me to comment. but style in writing is largely in the mind of the reader, except for certain gross things. thik this part over and decide for yourself. but if it involves no compromise with integrity, keeping the publisher happy is a good idea. if you could find time to discuss that part with someone there who will level with you, you might save yourself much work. tink's idea of style and their's might not be identical.

on my suggestion for your analysis, you are in the ballpark, but that is all. you are, to put it another way, aware of the symptoms but have not diagnosed the disease. you have not failed to miss the obvious import of increased military expenditures, a military policy. you should understand that appropriations this year does not mean the delivery of that for which appropriation is made this year. or, as i think you can or do understand, it is a projection for the future. it need not mean only the intent to use this stuff. it can be an economic device. but it does mean the stuff will be on hand. from here you have to go into the nature of the stuff, meaning its potential uses. i do not think he intends nuclear war. start all overagain, and start with the beginning of the whole thing, what so enormous a deficit means. they take t he things that followed, like the historic disbalance in trade, the first in what was it, 80 years? add all these things and others you will come to see together, and then understand that the talking about "secret" negotiations is not quite as nice as writing on a toilet wall that "Janie, 222-5646, puts out ", and then anaylze what he said of these "secret" negptiations, and analyze that. you do not have to read the whole message. you know enough about it. perhaps if you think in terms of the word i think i used, "desparation", you will get closer to base. all the things you say are true, but you have not pu t it all together.

it is not an added draft of all of PM. it is, i think, only the conclusions, and it is, if Lil has started it, only another NCR paper copy, probably dim. no cost but that of the paper. but she is busy, and we'll see when she has finished it.thanks on jp.

Specter will pull any swindle, like a free trip at taxpayer expense. he succeeds in saying nothing except that every investigation should be rigged....thanks for the clipping on noise. if you ever have a chance, try and talk to someone in your psych. dept to see if they know of any work or authorities on the damage from noise other than as meacured in decibels, the emptional harm...when Karl Hess talks about barry goldwater as a revolutionary, i think his conscience pricks.but huey newton did it to him as soon as this was in rpint, saying they will try and do it within the system. how unkind.

nixon again: herman piece excellent, but he hasn't answered his own questions and he remains in nixon's bag. he is wrong in minor ways, factually, like who really controls what there. that is not essential. he is very right on p.r., but neither he nor you address timing and as if it has meaning, what meaning? I return his fine piece so you can think further. maybe it will help to t ink of a camera and focus, but eliminating infinity. does he focus correctly, do you? what should be in the center and at what distance is the real focus? more clues i will not give or you will not be thinking. one: a figure, trees and forrest. best,